

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 were previously cancelled, and claims 3 through 5 remain pending.

Claim 3 (and thereby claims 4 and 5) have been amended as stated above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendment and the following remarks.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103

The Chambers reference has now been removed from the prior art. However, claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Houde et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,978,678) and Hammer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0166403).

The Examiner asserted that Houde et al. discloses the step b) claimed in claim 3 in Figures 1 and 3, column 2 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 22-43, and column 6 lines 24-36 of Houde et al. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. Reviewing Figures 1 and 3, column 2 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 22-43, and column 6 lines 24-36 of Houde et al., when the HLR receives a location request, the HLR determines which of MSCs the mobile station is served at and signals the currently serving MSC with a routing request signal (see column 2 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 22-29, and column 6 lines 24-26). When a TLDN that is assigned by the currently serving MSC in response to the routing request signal is received, the HLR generates an IDAD based on a country code and a city code of the currently serving MSC (column 5 lines 30-43, and column 6 lines 26-36). Therefore, it is clear that the determination of Houde et al. is performed at the HLR 22, and the step b) of the present invention is not disclosed by Houde et al.

The Examiner also asserted that Houde et al. discloses the step c) claimed in claim 3 of the present invention in figures 1 and 3, column 2 lines 37-55, column 5 line 29-column 6 line 4, and column 6 lines 26-53 of Houde et al. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion as well. Reviewing the disclosure of Houde et al., an IDAD is generated by the HLR 22 based on the ID of the currently serving MSC 34 and the TLDN transferred from the currently serving MSC 34 (see

column 2 lines 40-45, column 5 lines 35-43, and column 26-36). However, according to the present invention, the international routing number is generated by the currently serving MSC 34 by the step c). This means that an MSC of Houde et al. is not related to the generation of the international routing number.

Also, the Examiner asserted that Hammer et al. disclose a method for providing international roaming service to an international roaming mobile station 430 (figure 4) in which a mobile switching center (MSC) 420 in a serve domain (foreign country) generates an international routing number for the mobile station 430 when the MSC 420 receives a routing request (abstract, figures 4 and 5, and paragraphs 0011, 0015, 0016, and 0037-0045).

Reviewing the disclosure of Hammer et al. (abstract, figures 4 and 5, and paragraphs 0011, 0015, 0016, and 0037-0045), Hammer et al. disclose an International TLDN Translator 415 for modifying a TLDN provided from the MSC 420 in a serve domain (foreign country) to generate a modified TLDN or "Pseudo-TLDN". However, according to the present invention, the international routing number is generated from the currently serving MSC 34 by the step c), as mentioned by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to carefully review the disclosure of Hammer et al. with the present invention claimed in claim 3.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 which depends upon claim 3 is patentable for the same reasons as discussed above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Also, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houde et al. in view of Hammer et al., as applied to claims 3 and 5 above, and further in view of Koster (U.S. Pat. 6,259,914 B1).

The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to its base claim 3. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Further, though the Examiner asserted that the step d) recited in claim 4 is disclosed by Koster (U.S. Pat. 6,259,914 B1) in the abstract, Figure 1, column 3 lines

42-53, column 4 lines 3-14, and column 6 lines 8-17, the Applicant does not agree. When carefully reviewing the description of Koster, the MDN of Koster is assigned by IRS HLR (see column 3 lines 45-47 and column 4 lines 9-11), but the virtual origination number of the present invention is assigned by the MSC.

Therefore, it is asserted that Koster does not disclose the step d) of the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Houde et al., Hammer et al. and Koster is respectively requested.

Since all rejections have been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such a notice is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JIN-HONG KIM

By:



Steven J. Wietrzny
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 44,402
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4497
Tel. No. (414) 277-5415